VOLUME I (EXCERPT)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----x

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

vs. 5:11-CR-602

JOSEPH VINCENT JENKINS,

Defendant.

-----X

Transcript of a Jury Trial held on February 3, 2014, at the James Hanley Federal Building, 100 South Clinton Street, Syracuse, New York, the HONORABLE GLENN T. SUDDABY, United States District Judge, Presiding.

## APPEARANCES

For The Government: UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

P.O. Box 7198

100 South Clinton Street

Syracuse, New York 13261-7198
BY: TAMARA THOMSON, ESQ.
GWENDOLYN CARROLL, ESQ.

For Defendant: AARON M. GOLDSMITH, ESQ.

Attorney at Law 225 Broadway Suite 715

New York, New York 10007

Jodi L. Hibbard, RPR, CSR, CRR
Official United States Court Reporter
100 South Clinton Street
Syracuse, New York 13261-7367
(315) 234-8547

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

2.5

1 (Jury Selection was conducted and the jury was duly sworn.)

THE CLERK: Thank you, you may be seated.

THE COURT: Okay. First order of business, I'm going to give you a break, I'm going to have Bruce, our court security officer, show you back into that jury room, that's where you're going to be reporting every day, you can keep your things there, that's going to be your home away from home this week.

Trial schedule. Here's what I do. I start every day at 9:00. We'll endeavor to start on time. Sometimes there might be a short delay if we have some legal argument with the attorneys before you come out here but we are going to ask you to be in that jury room to start at 9:00 in the morning. And there is always some sort of breakfast food in there, not always going to promise you it's the most healthy thing, doughnuts, bagels, muffins, all that kind of stuff but it's there for you if you want it. And I go every day until 4:30, I try and get you out of here by 4:30 so that, you know, you can beat some of the rush hour traffic, get out of downtown and it's still getting dark kind of early so I try to get you out of here a little bit early. One caveat. is, if we have a witness on the stand that these attorneys tell me, Judge, if you spend five, ten minutes more, we can finish this witness up and they don't have to come back

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

tomorrow morning, I'm probably going to do that, all right.

But have in mind that I'm looking to break at 4:30 or shortly thereafter. There will be a morning break, an afternoon break.

You always, please, let the court security officer know, let the court staff know if you need a break, just let us know, give us a high sign, something, we'll give you a break, okay. If you need to stand up and stretch, there's going to be times when the attorneys are up here talking to me at the bench the way they have today, that's a time, feel free to stand up and stretch. I want you to be comfortable in this courtroom. Your tax dollars pay for it, okay, this is your courthouse, this is your courtroom, I want you to be comfortable. There's obviously rules that we follow like no food in here, you can bring bottles of water in which we will provide for you, and I'll give you some other preliminary instructions in a few minutes, but first of all, we're going to take a break, let you do that. If you have any things in the back, please collect them and take them into the jury room with you if you don't have them with you.

And please, as I admonished earlier today, don't talk about this case at all, with anybody. If anybody approaches you and tries to talk to you about this case, I need to know about it immediately. Now, that doesn't mean that you can't talk with your fellow jurors, I encourage you

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

2.5

to be friendly, talk about anything under the sun that you want to talk about except for this case, okay. We'll move it right along. So we're going to take a break, bring you out here, I'm going to give you a preliminary charge on the law and then we're going to have these attorneys give their opening statements on this criminal case. And once we're done with those opening statements, we'll see what time it is and decide whether we want to call any witnesses today or if it's time to send you home, okay, with that 4:30 rule. right. Any questions? All right. We'll take about a five-minute break. Go ahead. (Jury Excused, 3:27 p.m.) THE COURT: Mr. Jenkins, the same thing, if you ever need a break or something, please just let Mr. Goldsmith The only difference is that if we're going to move you, we have to do it with the jury out of the room, so I just, and if you need to just get to him, let me know, he can ask to take a break, I'll get the jury out of the room and let you go use the facilities whenever you need to, okay? THE DEFENDANT: All right. THE COURT: All right. (Court in recess, 3:29 p.m. to 3:41 p.m.) (Open Court, Jury Out.) THE COURT: Is the government ready? We're going

to bring this jury in, I'm going to do a preliminary

instruction, and then we will go on to opening statements.

Defense counsel all set?

MR. GOLDSMITH: Ready.

2.2

2.5

THE COURT: Okay. And it doesn't look like -we'll see what time it is, but I don't know that it makes any
sense to try to start a witness, but we'll see, okay. Please
bring them in.

(Jury Present.)

THE COURT: Please be seated. We're missing somebody. Looks like it's fine except for one juror. There we go, we found them.

Okay. The record should reflect we have the ladies and gentlemen of the jury, government and defense counsel and the defendant. One more housekeeping issue. As I indicated, you can bring water in here, nothing else, but when you come into the courtroom, you're going to notice that everybody's standing up in the courtroom, okay. You come in and sit right down. The reason they're standing, it's an old tradition and it's a very nice one that I agree with firmly, they stand in honor of your service, the fact that you're here performing a service as citizens of this country, so when a jury comes into a courtroom, the litigants and attorneys all stand until you're here and seated. So come right in and sit right down, okay. Sometimes I have jurors come in the courtroom and say, am I supposed to be standing

2.2

2.5

or sitting? Come right in and sit down, okay, that's what that's about.

Now first thing we're going to do is preliminary instructions for this criminal case. Before we begin the trial, I'd like to tell you about what will be happening. I want to describe how the trial will proceed and be conducted and explain what we'll be doing, that is the lawyers, the court, and even you. At the end of the trial we'll give you more detailed guidance on how you are to go about reaching your decision, I'll explain to you how the trial will proceed and give you an overview of the claims.

In this case, the defendant is charged with two felony counts for violating 18 U.S.C. Section 2252 and 2256, transportation of child pornography and possession of child pornography. I will give you detailed instructions on the law at the end of the case on those, those instructions will control your deliberations and decision. But in order to help you follow the evidence, I will now give you a brief summary of the elements of the offense that the government must prove to make its case.

Generally, to prove the defendant guilty of transportation of child pornography, the government must prove each of the four following elements beyond a reasonable doubt: First, that the defendant knowingly transported a visual depiction as that term will later be defined; and two,

2.2

2.5

that that visual depiction was transported in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce, or as the visual depiction was produced using materials that had been transported in or affecting interstate commerce; three, that that visual depiction was child pornography as that term will later be defined for you; and four, that the defendant knew of the sexually explicit nature of the material and that the visual depiction was of an actual minor engaged in that sexually explicit conduct.

Generally to prove that the defendant is guilty of possession of child pornography, the government must prove each of the following four elements beyond a reasonable doubt. This is the second count. First of all, the first element, that the defendant knowingly possessed a visual depiction as that term will later be defined; two, that that visual depiction was transported in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce; or usual depiction, the usual depiction was produced using materials that had been transported in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce; and three, that the visual depiction was child pornography as that term will later be defined; and fourth, excuse me, that the defendant knew of the sexually explicit nature of the material, and that the visual depiction was of an actual minor engaged in that sexually explicit conduct.

In addition, the government seeks pursuant to 18

2.2

2.5

U.S.C. Section 2253(a)(3), the criminal forfeiture of three items of the defendant's personal property that were allegedly used or intended to be used in the course of committing the previously described offenses. Those three items are a Toshiba laptop computer, an 8-gigabyte USB thumb drive and a 4-gigabyte USB thumb drive. The government's burden of proof with regard to the criminal forfeiture of these three items is by a preponderance of the evidence. And I'll explain the different burdens that you must follow.

What's the duty of the jury? It will be your duty to find from the evidence what the facts are. You and you alone are the judges of the facts. You will then have to apply those facts to the law as the court will give it to you. You must follow the law whether you agree with it or not. Nothing the court may say or do during the course of the trial is intended to indicate or should be taken by you as indicating what your verdict should be. That is solely in your province.

Now evidence, what's evidence? Evidence from which you will find the facts will consist of the testimony of witnesses, documents, or other things received into the record as exhibits, and any facts the lawyers agree or stipulate to, or that the court may instruct you to find. Certain things are not evidence and must not be considered by you and I will list them for you now. Statements, arguments,

2.2

2.5

and questions by the lawyers are not evidence. Objections to questions are not evidence. Lawyers have an obligation to their clients to make an objection when they believe evidence being offered is improper under the Rules of Evidence. You should not be influenced by the objection or by the court's ruling on it. If the objection is sustained, that means the witness does not have to answer the question. In that case, you must disregard the question and any response that was given to that question. If the objection is overruled, that means the witness will then be required to answer the question. In that case you should treat the answer like any other.

If you are instructed that some item of evidence is received for a limited purpose only, you must follow that instruction. Testimony that the court has excluded or told you to disregard is not evidence and must not be considered. Anything you have seen or heard outside the courtroom is not evidence and must be disregarded. You are to decide the case on the evidence presented here in this courtroom, and in this courtroom alone.

There are two kinds of evidence, direct and circumstantial evidence. Direct evidence is direct proof of a fact such as testimony of an eyewitness. Circumstantial evidence is proof of facts that which you -- from which you may infer or conclude other facts exist. I will give you

2.2

2.5

further instruction on these as well as other matters at the end of the case but have in mind that you may consider both kinds of evidence.

It will be up to you to decide which witnesses to believe, which witnesses not to believe, and how much of any witness' testimony to accept or reject. I will give you some guidelines for determining the credibility of witnesses at the end of the case.

Now direct and circumstantial evidence. I'm going to talk a little bit more about this because it's important that you understand first of all that you can accept both kinds of evidence. One is not given more weight than another. But the difference is direct evidence is evidence of an eyewitness so to speak, somebody who was present, saw, heard, smelled, can give some direct testimony about some observation that they made by their senses. They saw it, they heard it, they smelled it, something, okay. And circumstantial evidence is a little different. It's facts inferred from facts that lead to a logical conclusion.

Here's an example. The weather's warmed up. The snow on your front lawn may have melted, you look out there, you see the brown somewhat dark grass or whatever might be on your front lawn. You look out there tonight, that's the situation, you go to bed. You wake up in the morning, you look out on your lawn and it's covered with white fluffy

2.2

2.5

stuff, which is supposed to happen over the next couple days as a matter of fact. Now, you did not see it snow because you were in bed sleeping. But circumstantially, you can infer at some time during the night when you were sleeping, it snowed. A logical conclusion based on what you've seen in your life's experiences, okay, circumstantial evidence.

Now let's take it a step further. Let's say you have a paper boy, if they exist anymore, and they deliver your paper in the morning in your door at like 6:00 in the morning. You're up at 5:30, quarter to 6, check your door, no paper. You look out, you look out across your lawn, there's fresh snow, there's no footprints, there's no footprints up your walk to your front door, no paper. So circumstantially you say, I guess the paper boy hasn't come yet. You go back to your door at 6:30, you open it, there's a paper. You look out across your lawn, footprints across your lawn right up to your front walk to your front door, so circumstantially, based on the two things, you didn't see anybody deliver that paper but you know based on what you've seen from the footprints, the fact that the paper's in the door, that somebody delivered that paper.

You may not know who it was unless you have some further evidence like your, you know, paper boy is of a certain size, may wear certain type of boots where you could compare the footprints in the snow to his boots, maybe a

2.2

2.5

neighbor says I saw the paper boy down the street from your house just a few minutes later and you put all those facts together and circumstantially you can infer that it was a particular individual, maybe your paper boy that delivered your paper. Okay. So you get what I mean, that's the idea of circumstantial evidence, facts that lead you to some logical conclusion, okay, based on your life's experiences.

Now, let's talk about rules of a criminal case. As you know this is a criminal case. There are three basic rules about a criminal case that you must keep in mind.

First, the defendant is presumed innocent until proven guilty. The indictment against the defendant brought by the government is only an accusation, nothing more. It is not proof of guilt or anything else. The defendant therefore starts out with a clean slate.

Second, the burden of proof is on the government until the very end of the case. The defendant has no burden to prove his or her innocence or to present any evidence or to testify. Since the defendant has a right to remain silent, the law prohibits you from arriving at your verdict by considering that the defendant may not have testified. No inference for or against in any way, okay.

Third, the government must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. Now what do I mean by beyond a reasonable doubt? It is not some vague,

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

2.5

speculative, imaginary or inconceivable doubt. Nor is it a doubt based upon emotion, sympathy, prejudice, or upon some of you -- what some of you may consider to be an unpleasant The government is not required to prove a defendant quilty beyond every conceivable or every possible doubt. But you should review all the evidence as you remember it, sift out what you believe, discuss it, analyze it, compare your views of the evidence with that of your fellow jurors and if that process produces in your mind some belief or conviction that you would be willing to accept without further hesitation if it was a matter of importance to you, then you may say that you have been convinced beyond a reasonable doubt. On the other hand, if going through that same process in your mind, your mind is wavering, or you are so uncertain that you would hesitate before acting if it were an important matter of your own, then you have not been convinced beyond a reasonable doubt and your verdict must be not guilty. I will give you further instructions on this point of law later, but bear in mind that in this respect, a criminal case is different than a civil case, different type of burden and the burden always remains with the government.

Let's talk about the course of the trial. In a few minutes we're going to begin this trial. First, the government will make an opening statement which is simply an outline to help you understand the evidence as it comes in.

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

2.5

Next, defendant's attorney may, but does not have to, make an opening statement. Opening statements are neither evidence nor argument. Now I say he may but does not have to because, once again, defendant has no burden, he can sit there and do nothing. It's up to him and his attorney to decide whether they want to do opening statements, whether they want to examine witnesses, or you know, whatever they want to do is totally within a defendant's right to decide. The government will then present its witnesses and counsel for the defendant may cross-examine them. Following the government's case, the defendant may, if he decides to, present witnesses or evidence and those witnesses, the government may cross-examine. After all the evidence is in, the attorneys will present their closing arguments to summarize and interpret the evidence for you, and the court will instruct you on the law. After that, you will retire to deliberate and render a verdict.

What's the conduct of a jury? Our law requires jurors to follow certain instructions in order to help assure a just and fair trial. I will now give you those instructions. Do not converse either among yourselves or with anyone else about anything related to the case. You may tell the people with whom you live and your employer that you are jurors and give them the information about when you will be required to be in court, but you may not talk with them or

anyone else about anything related to this case.

2.2

2.5

Do not at any time during the trial request, accept, agree to accept or discuss with any person the receipt or acceptance of any payment or benefit in return for supplying any information concerning this trial. You must promptly report directly to me any incident within your knowledge involving an attempt by any person to improperly influence you or any other member of this jury.

Do not visit or view the premises or place where the charged crime was allegedly committed or any other premise or place involved in this case. You must not use internet maps or Google Earth or any other program or device to search for or view any location discussed in the testimony. Do not read, view, or listen to any accounts or discussions of the case reported by newspapers, television, radio, the internet, or other news media. Excuse me. Do not attempt to research any fact, issue, or law related to this case whether by discussion with others, by research in a library or on the internet or by any other source.

In this age of instant electronic communication and research, I want to emphasize that in addition to not conversing face-to-face with anyone about the case, you must not communicate with anyone about the case by any other means, including by telephone, text message, e-mail, internet chat, chat rooms, blogs, social websites, such as Facebook,

2.2

2.5

MySpace or Twitter. You must not provide any information about the case to anyone by any means whatsoever. And that includes the posting of information about the case or what you are doing in the case on any device or internet site including blog, chat rooms, social websites, and any other means. You must also not Google or otherwise search for any information about the case or the law which applies to the case, or the people involved in the case, including the defendant, the witnesses, the lawyers, or even me, the judge. You can do any and all of that after the case is over, but not during this case.

Now ladies and gentlemen, I want you to understand why these rules are so important. First of all, our law does not permit jurors to converse with anyone else about the case or permit anyone to talk to them about the case, excuse me, because only jurors are authorized to render a verdict and only you have been found to be fair and impartial and only you have promised to be fair. No one else has been so qualified. Our law does not permit jurors to converse among themselves about the case until the court tells them to begin deliberations because premature discussion can lead to premature final decisions. We want to avoid that. Our law also does not permit you to visit a place discussed in the testimony. First of all, you cannot always be sure that the place is in the same condition as it was on the day in

2.2

2.5

question; second, even if it were in the same condition, once you go to a place discussed in the testimony to evaluate the evidence in light of what you see, you become a witness, not a juror. As a witness you may now have an erroneous view of the scene that may not be subject to correction by either party and that is just not fair.

Finally, our law requires that you not read or listen to any news accounts of the case and that you not attempt to research any fact, issue, or law related to the case because your decision must be based solely on the testimony and other evidence presented in this courtroom. It would not be fair to the parties for you to base your decision on some reporter's view or opinion or upon information you acquire outside of this courtroom.

Now these rules are designed to help guarantee a fair trial and our law accordingly sets forth serious consequences if the rules are not followed. I trust you understand and appreciate the importance of following these rules in accordance with your oath and promise, I know you will do so.

Finally, do not form any opinion until all the evidence is in. Keep an open mind until you start your deliberations at the end of the case.

If you wish, you may take notes, but if you do, please leave them in the jury room when you leave at night.

2.2

2.5

And remember, they are for your own personal use, they are not to be given or read to anyone else and if you do take notes, please do not let those note taking, that note taking distract you from what the witnesses have to say or how they, the witnesses may answer questions. Notes are not entitled to any greater weight than the memory or impression of each juror as to what the testimony may have been. Whether you take notes or not, each of you must form and express your own opinion as to the facts of the case. If you do not take notes, you should rely upon your own memory of what was said and not be overly influenced by the notes of other jurors.

Now, excuse me, note taking. Relatively new thing, we never, when I was trying cases, jurors were never allowed to keep notes. And there were some good reasons for it, I'm going to tell you about those. First of all, we have a court reporter, a professional whose responsibility is to take down each and every thing that's said in this courtroom and going to make sure people talk one at a time for that very purpose. We're a court of record, and if we have a question about some aspect of testimony, we can always have it read back. We can have Jodi go and find it for us, and she'll read it back for us, okay.

Secondly, it is very important when you're watching a witness testify, that you not only hear what they say, but you watch how they testify. People's demeanor is important.

2.2

2.5

When you're trying to decide, even if it's a couple of kids who may have broken something in your house, and you're asking them questions about what happened, it's not only what they say, it's how they say it that's important, right, and it's making a determination of what happened and who did what. That's how we decide things. So people's demeanor, the way they answer questions, their reactions on the witness stand are important and we don't want note taking to interfere with you making those observations, because that's how we make decisions about who is telling us the truth, okay.

Now, so why do we allow note taking? Because in recent years I think the courts have recognized that some people just remember things better if they have a notepad and they jot things down. A lot of people just listen that way, and are able to retain things that way. If you're one of those people, that's fine. But just understand, don't let it interfere with you observing the witnesses well and understand that they'll be kept here in the jury room at night, they're not to leave this courthouse, they're court exhibits which will stay here and will be locked up at night and they're for your own personal use only.

And I would say this. We don't expect this to be a long trial. If there was a trial that was going on for weeks, then maybe note taking becomes more important for you,

2.2

2.5

because there's going to be a long list of multiple witnesses just to keep track in your own head, but if you're one of those people who feel more comfortable listening and paying attention and hearing what's being said by having a notepad to jot down, feel free to do it. Okay. That's your choice. Any questions? About your role or what we're going to be doing? Okay. We're going to proceed now with opening remarks and we're going to start with the government.

Ms. Thomson, when you're ready.

MS. THOMSON: Thank you, your Honor. On May 24, 2009, Joseph Jenkins entered Canada from Jefferson County. He had with him a Toshiba laptop and two thumb drives and on that laptop and on those thumb drives together were a total of 30 -- over 3800 images of child pornography, and over a hundred videos of child pornography. His laptop. His thumb drives. His collection that he was taking with him on his trip to Canada.

Good afternoon. As you may recall earlier, my name is Tamara Thomson and together with Gwen Carroll, we represent the United States of America. And it is our pleasure to present this case to you. Sitting at trial table is Chad Willard, he's a special agent with Homeland Security. Also his pleasure to bring this case before this jury.

At Alexandria Bay, there begins the border to Canada at the Port of Lansdowne and at that border point,

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

2.5

there is a border checkpoint, and when we were talking in voir dire, I believe most of you actually indicated that you had crossed a border so you have some familiarity with a border checkpoint.

Now the purpose of those border checkpoints are to inspect people and things that go into Canada. And so Canadian Border Service Agency officers look to see what's coming in and who's coming in, and the purpose is they want to make sure that for the people, they don't allow anyone in who's unauthorized and for the goods, they don't allow any goods that are unauthorized or illegal or may be subject to So as a result, they have a border checkpoint. That border checkpoint at the Port of Lansdowne begins with a primary inspection. On May 24, 2009, morning hours, at primary inspection lane number 5, was Border Services Officer Pedro Sousa-Dias and you'll hear testimony from him that that morning he was working inspection lane number 5 and at approximately 9 a.m., a Navy 2003 Dodge pickup truck carrying a trailer that had on its bed two ATV vehicles in tow came into his lane and he encountered the defendant Joseph Jenkins.

Now the defendant was the only one in that vehicle. He was the driver, sole occupant of the truck. And so when he identified himself as Joseph Jenkins, Officer Sousa-Dias did what you do at a border checkpoint and he asked some

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

2.5

questions. When he asked those questions, he noticed, because it's his job to do, to pay attention to the people and the things that are coming into Canada, he noticed that the defendant appeared to be nervous. He noticed that the defendant was avoiding eye contact. And as a result, he decided that he should defer him into immigration to have a check to make sure everything was okay. So the defendant was directed to go inside to immigration for a criminal check, to make sure that he was permitted to enter Canada.

And when he went inside, he encountered Melany Boyd who at that time was another border services officer who was at the immigration counter in the secondary building. Jenkins presented her with his passport and the slip that he received from Officer Sousa-Dias for the in -- for the secondary, and she began her interview, again basic questions, basic questions that these officers do routinely. She asked him his citizenship, he indicated he was a United States citizen, she asked him the purpose of his trip, he indicated he was going to visit his parents who had a cottage in Quebec and were summer residents there. Asked how long he was going to stay, he indicated one week. And they asked --Officer Boyd asked him what his occupation was and he indicated he was a self-employed electrician. You'll hear testimony from Officer Melany Boyd, when she was asking him these questions and trying to get this information from

2.2

2.5

Mr. Jenkins, that he appeared nervous, that he was evasive with his answers and he also wasn't making eye contact. She also made an observation that the defendant, when he pulled into that secondary area, was driving the truck with a trailer attached and she noticed that he had a lot of personal belongings.

Now given his answers about his purpose for the trip and how long he was going to stay, and knowing that she heard him say he was a self-employed electrician, she thought that perhaps he intended to stay in Canada for longer and she decided it would be prudent for a vehicle examination because of those factors. His behaviors plus all of the things that he was bringing into Canada. And so she directed him for a vehicle examination.

Now three officers came to perform that vehicle examination. These are also border services officers and you'll hear testimony from these officers, Officers Tristan Garrah, Jarret Johnston, and Glen Hache, and their job was to conduct a vehicle inspection. And in the course of doing that job, they also had an opportunity to talk to the defendant. And when one of the officers did talk to Joseph Jenkins, he stated he was the owner of the truck, he was aware of what was inside it, and that he had in fact packed it himself, and so the vehicle inspection began.

Toshiba laptop was located in the rear passenger's

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

2.5

seat, and he was asked about that laptop and the defendant indicated that the laptop was new, that he had had it for over a year, he used it for personal use and he had it stored in a box and he indicated that he had it in the box because he didn't possess a carrying case for it. So Officer Johnston, with the authority to do so, opened up that Toshiba laptop and when he opened it up, he clicked on a file shortcut, you'll hear testimony about what that is, clicked on that file shortcut, and what he saw gave him some pause. He saw a video of a young female and she wasn't wearing any clothing. He viewed another video, gave him more pause for concern and he realized that perhaps out in this open area wasn't appropriate to really see this stuff where the public could see and he thought it was appropriate for further examination to be done because what was on that computer may be prohibited. And so he brought that laptop inside the building for further inspection. And while he was viewing those items, other officers also viewed items on that laptop and they also had been doing the search of Mr. Jenkins' truck, and while doing the search they recovered other items that became significant. Those items included another laptop, three thumb drives, testimony that those thumb drives included a thumb drive with a storage capacity of 2 gigabytes, 4 gigabytes, and 8 gigabytes. Recovered some compact disks, a Belkin notebook card, an Olympus camera and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

2.5

Motorola cellular phone. Those were the items that were recovered from the truck and they were brought inside, again, for further examination.

Now at this point, defendant asked why his laptops were being brought inside. And the officers asked Mr. Jenkins if he had child pornography on his computer, and he stated, not to my knowledge. I don't think so. He was asked, have you ever downloaded child pornography? And again his response was, no, I don't think so.

Now inside that building an examination was conducted of an 8-gigabyte thumb drive, and when that was examined, officers found a video whose title gave them a sneak preview of what they were to see. That video, and you'll also hear it called multimedia so those two words you'll hear throughout this trial, but that video was titled "9YO Vicky stripping and sucking kiddie pedo legal underage preteen" is the title of the video. And the officers watched the video, a minute and 39 seconds in length. The video began of a girl fully dressed and that girl was prepubescent, meaning she hadn't hit puberty yet, it was a young girl, and as the video continued she began to undress until she got all the way down to just stockings. And as the video ended, the young girl approaches the camera, man unzips his pants exposing his penis and performs oral sex. That's the video the officers saw from that 8-gigabyte thumb drive.

2.2

2.5

watched others and you'll hear the testimony about those other videos that they viewed and as a result of watching that video and others, the defendant Mr. Jenkins was taken into custody and charged with violating Canadian law.

You will hear testimony that a Canadian Border Service Agency officer, criminal investigator, sat with the defendant and she asked him if he knew what child pornography was and he said that he did. And when she told him that some child pornography was found on the media devices found in his truck, the defendant's reply was to ask to speak to his parents.

You'll hear testimony that a trial was set in Canada, that trial for October 2010, but the defendant did not appear for that trial, and therefore, the trial did not go forward.

Now, we talked a little bit about the port of entry at Lansdowne. Before you hit that port of entry, you come through Jefferson County and Alexandria Bay, and also on that side are United States investigators including special agents with Homeland Security. Homeland Security has this side of the border, American side of the border, and when the defendant did not appear for those charges in Canada and when that trial did not go forward, U.S. authorities went forward here, and set about to do so. Agents began their own investigation and took steps to obtain that evidence from

2.2

2.5

Canada. And they were able to retrieve the items from Canada and in July of 2011, an agent appeared before a federal magistrate judge and obtained a search warrant to search each of the items that was recovered from the defendant at the Port of Lansdowne after he had crossed into the Port of Lansdowne from Jefferson County, and they obtained those items that had been seized from the defendant from the Ontario Provincial Police.

Once in the custody of HSI, those items were examined and you will hear testimony from the forensic agent who examined the items, and that is Brian Braisted. He is a computer forensic agent and he is trained to do forensic examinations of computer and other electronic media and cell phones and the like.

In this trial he will testify as to what his analysis found, and he will testify in the area of computer forensics regarding how he did the examination, and all of the results that he found. You will hear testimony that that examination involved him finding over 3,800 images and over 100 video files on each of those three items that I've indicated, the Toshiba laptop, the 8-gigabyte thumb drive, and the 4-gigabyte thumb drive, and each of those three items, the laptop and the thumb drives, are electronic media that's not made in the state of New York.

You will hear testimony with regard to where those

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

2.5

image files were found, where the video files were found. You will hear testimony about the registry information for that laptop computer, that it was registered to a user by the name of Joe. You will hear testimony about web pages that were saved to the Toshiba laptop as favorites. You will hear testimony that a photograph was recovered from that Toshiba laptop, photograph of the defendant, because as he acknowledged at the border, it was his laptop.

Agent Braisted will show you the evidence, you'll see the laptop computer and he will also walk through various dates that were forensically significant, dates that show activity on that computer, not just activity that involved saving and where child pornography was saved but activity that was going on concurrently with the child pornography, such as e-mail accounts that were being accessed. Listen to the names of those e-mail accounts that were accessed on or around the same time the child pornography was detected on that computer. Agent Braisted will also show you not just what that computer was in its form, you've all seen a laptop, he'll show you what it looked like when he examined it. He will show you screen shots of what was on that computer. will show you screen shots of the information that was saved into that computer, and he will explain the significance of his findings. In summary, you will hear that on the Toshiba laptop, there were multiple video files containing child

2.5

pornography in a folder that was called New Folder 2, a folder that was saved to the desktop.

On the desktop's user account Joe, you will hear testimony of the graphic files, again we often call them graphic or image or picture files, and you'll hear testimony where it was found in the system volume information and he'll explain to you what that means. You'll also hear testimony that installed on that Toshiba laptop and on the Compaq laptop was file wiping software. CCleaner, and you'll hear what that means forensically.

You'll hear testimony about registration of thumb drive use, how looking at the Toshiba laptop, it's possible to establish whether or not any particular thumb drive had ever been mounted to the laptop and you will hear testimony that both the 8-gigabyte and the 4-gigabyte thumb drives both had child pornography on it, were mounted into the Toshiba laptop. You will also hear internet history artifacts showing websites that were accessed by the user of that computer. Most of the titles of those websites give the subject away. You will also hear from Agent Brian Braisted that on that 8-gigabyte thumb drive he located 96 videos and 15 picture files of child pornography, and on the 4-gigabyte thumb drive, 10 videos, 3,266 images of child pornography. Also on that 4-gigabyte thumb drive you'll hear about a document that was saved to that thumb drive, that document,

2.5

you'll receive testimony, you'll get to see it contained a phrase "Lolita House XXX", and again, oftentimes the title lets you know exactly what you might expect to find. There's a file name referenced in that text document of a Sasha\_S3, and you'll also hear testimony that that video file was found on the 8-gigabyte thumb drive and you will get to see a clip of that video.

Where there was no child pornography found on particular media, Agent Braisted will testify to that as well. He'll tell you exactly what he found and exactly which pieces he analyzed. And Agent Braisted will take you through that forensic examination. It will be lengthy testimony, but it's very important because it explains exactly how that child pornography came to that laptop and exactly what was contained on that laptop.

And there's one more thing that you're going to see. We talked a little bit about it in the voir dire. The court forewarned you about it and so now I'd like to forewarn you about it as well. You're going to see the pictures and you're going to see the videos themselves. And we understand they are difficult to view, and just so you know, we are not going to show all 3,800, and a hundred videos to you. We are going to show you a very, very small portion. We will show you respect, and we will show the children depicted in those images and those videos respect

2.2

2.5

and we'll show you a very small portion. We will show them to you because they are the evidence in this case, and as difficult as it is to have to look at it and watch it, it's the evidence in this case.

The images themselves will be given to you in a binder, each one of you will have your own copy of a binder. On the front page of the binder we'll show you where that image was found and on the reverse side will be the image itself. As I indicated, we will limit it as much as possible, but as we bear the burden of proof in this case, we must show you what the defendant had on his laptop, and on his thumb drives.

As a result of what he had, and going from Alex Bay going into Canada, he was charged with two counts in the United States of transporting child pornography and possessing child pornography, and that first count is that on or about May 24, 2009, the defendant violated Title 18, Section 2252A(a)(1), 2256(8)(a), by knowingly and unlawfully transporting child pornography, and Count 2 charges on or about May 24, 2009, Joseph Jenkins violated Title 18, United States Code, Section 2252A(a)(5)(B) and 2256(8)(a).

On May 24, 2009, the defendant, Joseph Jenkins, transported and possessed child pornography. He drove his truck to Canada with his laptops and his thumb drives. All that he packed and all that he acknowledged were

2.2

2.5

his, including that Toshiba laptop and including those two thumb drives. He transported that collection from Jefferson County into Ontario, Canada.

After the last witness has testified and after all the evidence has been presented to you, we will stand before you again and on behalf of the United States of America, we will ask you to return a verdict of guilty on those two counts, because he transported it, and he possessed it. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay, thank you, Counsel. Defense counsel, do you choose to make an opening statement?

MR. GOLDSMITH: We do, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay, proceed when you're ready.

MR. GOLDSMITH: Thank you. May I approach?

THE COURT: You may.

MR. GOLDSMITH: Not to my knowledge. Not to my knowledge. A phrase that the government has just told you it is going to have witnesses testify Mr. Jenkins said on May 24th, 2009. Knowledge, as the government, as the court has also explained briefly, and as you're going to hear several instructions later on, the key element in the crimes charged against Mr. Jenkins before this court that you as the jury will be deciding. The government meets its burden of proof if it can establish all of the elements beyond a reasonable doubt.

2.2

2.5

Ladies and gentlemen, I will reintroduce myself.

I'm Aaron Goldsmith, and I have the pleasure of representing

Joseph Jenkins in this trial today. I want to thank you for

all of the time and attention that you spent already in this

process, and certainly for the time and attention that we

expect from you in the coming week.

As you've heard some discussion about, by the government, by the court, you will hear more about the presumption of innocence. In a court of law in the United States of America, an individual facing criminal charges is presumed innocent until proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. Ladies and gentlemen, that means that right now, 4:30 p.m. on February 3rd, 2014, as we, the lawyers in this case, have been presenting opening arguments to you, Joseph Jenkins stands before you an innocent man. He remains innocent in this courtroom, unless you the jury find that the government proves each and every element of the crimes charged against him beyond a reasonable doubt. And the court at the close of this case will instruct you further, as to what those — that means legally, as to what those elements are.

The government, as the court has also instructed you, bears the burden of proof at this trial. As the court has discussed a bit during our jury selection process,

Mr. Jenkins bears absolutely no burden whatsoever. But it's

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

2.5

that burden of proof that brings me into what I want you as the jury to focus on at this trial. As part of your role, responsibilities, as your jobs as the jurors, seek out that burden that the government is saddled with. By that burden, every witness that takes that stand, listen to them, watch them, read any documents that the government may try to introduce at this case. Watch and look and examine every piece of evidence that the government is going to try and introduce in this case through those witnesses. Listen to what those witnesses saw, what they heard, what they did, and scrutinize every one of those witnesses, every one of those documents, every piece of evidence that comes into this courtroom. Does that evidence show, does that testimony show Mr. Jenkins did what the government has to prove beyond a reasonable doubt or what they claim he did? Can they establish all of the elements of their case with what those witnesses and what that evidence is going to prove?

As we have also discussed, as the court, the government, myself, this evidence is unpleasant, and it is necessary to look past the unpleasantness of what that evidence is, to scrutinize whether the government has proven its case. It is difficult and we all acknowledge that. But again, it must be looked past. When you're looking at the evidence, when you're watching the witnesses, when you are listening to the witnesses, when you are weighing what those

2.2

2.5

witnesses say, when you scrutinize them, scrutinize them not only for what they saw and heard and did, but for what they did not see, did not hear, did not do in their capacity, what difference was it in what they saw or did or were able to achieve that is different from what another agent or different authority was able to produce in this case.

I submit to you the evidence will show that there are differences in what law enforcement agents and agencies were able to produce in the investigation of this case. That will bear out at this trial, and that will bear into your analysis of whether the government has met its burden. Which again, I submit to you, they will not be able to do.

ago in discussing the nature of circumstantial evidence. The paper boy delivering the paper every morning. Paper on the front porch, footsteps in the snow. Time frame in which seen before and there was nothing, only a short while later, there was something. Paper, the footprints, the snow that would show the footprints. In this particular case, I submit to you that when the government finishes all of its witnesses, finishes bringing in all of its evidence and testimony, there's not going to be footprints, there's not going to be the footprints of Mr. Joseph Jenkins. Without any other possibility of who those footprints were, who left them there, when they left them there, and the circumstances that

2.2

2.5

they left those footprints, when the witness comes up and testifies Mr. Joseph Jenkins said, not to my knowledge, you'll remember that. And you'll remember that you didn't see the footsteps of Mr. Joseph Jenkins in the snow. And at the close of this case, I believe that after due deliberation and scrutiny of every witness that you see and hear, scrutiny of the evidence that you see, that you will find Mr. Jenkins not guilty. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Counsel. Ladies and gentlemen, I have 4:38, eight minutes past my time to get you home. So I'm going to let you go home, we'll have our first witness called tomorrow morning. Please do not discuss the case with anyone. If anyone approaches you, tries to talk to you about this case, I need to know about it immediately. As I indicated, please be in the jury room so we can start at 9:00, there will be some breakfast food in there for you. Do not view, read, or listen to anything to do with this case. Should it be reported anywhere, put it aside, shut it off, turn it off, whatever, and you can do all that stuff after the case is over with but we do not want you improperly influenced during the pendency of this trial. Okay. Have a good night, travel safe, and we'll see you tomorrow morning.

(Jury Excused, 4:38 p.m.)

THE COURT: Okay. The jury's been excused for the night. Government will start at 9:00, have your first

witness here ready to go and we'll get started. Is there 1 2 anything else we need to address before we adjourn for the 3 night? Government, no? MR. GOLDSMITH: Just as a simple matter of 4 5 courtesy, I wonder if the government might tell me the first few witnesses they plan on calling tomorrow. 6 7 THE COURT: That's between you and them. I'll let you do it off the record after I've concluded proceedings 8 9 here and you can talk to them about it. Whatever you guys 10 want to work out is fine with me. Anything else, Mr. Goldsmith? 11 12 MR. GOLDSMITH: Not from defense, no. 13 THE COURT: Okay. We will see you tomorrow 14 morning. 15 THE CLERK: Court's in recess. 16 (Court Adjourned, 4:39 p.m.) 17 18 19 20 21 2.2 23 24 2.5

Case 5:11-cr-00602-GTS Document 165 Filed 05/30/14 Page 38 of 38